



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/796,213

03/10/2004

Kunihiko Hayashi

2004\_0378A

2393

52349

7590

05/07/2009

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.

1030 15th Street, N.W.

Suite 400 East

Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

TO, JENNIFER N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2195

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/07/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/796,213	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAYASHI, KUNIHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b> JENNIFER N. TO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending for examination.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/24/2009 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1, 3-14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - a. The following terms lacks antecedent basis:
    - i. said respective units – claims 1, 9;
  - b. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
    - i. as per claim 1, line 12, it is not clearly understood what is meant by “a memory unit in which programs for causing said respective units to

Art Unit: 2195

function are stored" (i.e. a memory unit stored programs for causing said assigning unit, said switching unit, and said selecting unit to function).

ii. as per claim 9, it has the same deficiency as claim 1 above.

Appropriate correction is required.

iii. as per claims 3-8, 10-13, and 17, they are rejected for incorporating the above errors from their respective parent claims by dependency.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama et al. (hereafter Akiyama) (U.S. Patent No. 6430594), and in view of Anderson et al. (hereafter Anderson) (U.S. Patent No. 5628013).

4. Akiyama and Anderson were cited in the previous office action.

5. As per claim 1, Akiyama teaches the invention substantially as claim including a task switching apparatus for switching execution of a task assigned to a time slot by switching time slots in a processor (abstract), comprising:

a time slot switching unit operable to switch time slots when an execution time of a task reaches an assignment time (figs. 1, 10; col. 6, lines 15-50); a task selecting unit operable to select a first task from the plurality of first tasks assigned to the first time slots when said time slot switching unit switches a current time slot to a time slot other than the second time slot, and to select at least one second task from the plurality of second tasks assigned to the second time slot when the current time slot is switched to the second time slot (col. 3, lines 54-65; col. 5, lines 15-60; col. 6, lines 14-63); and

a memory in which programs for causing said respective units to function are stored, and a processor which executes the programs (col. 1, lines 11-14).

6. Akiyama did not specifically teaches unit operable to assign, on a one to one basis, each of a plurality of first tasks to first time slots among a plurality of time slots within a predetermined period, and assign a plurality of second tasks different from the plurality of first tasks to a single second time slot among the plurality of time slots within the predetermined period, the plurality of tasks each having an assignment time, the single second time lot no for being assigned to any of the plurality of first tasks.

7. However, Anderson teaches unit operable to assign, on a one to one basis, each of a plurality of first tasks to first time slots among a plurality of time slots within a period, and assign a plurality of second tasks different from the plurality of first tasks to a single second time slot among the plurality of time slots within the period (abstract; col. 2, lines 64-67; col. 3, lines 9-13, 20-47; col. 6, lines 19-63).

Art Unit: 2195

8. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of to assign, on a one to one basis, each of a plurality of first tasks to first time slots among a plurality of time slots within a period, and assign a plurality of second tasks different from the plurality of first tasks to a single second time slot among the plurality of time slots within the period as disclosed in Anderson's system into Akiyama's stem to produce a system that controlling execution time in the system so that real-time tasks from a different applications can be dynamically scheduled without conflicts on the system as suggested in Anderson (col. 1, lines 9-13).

9. It is also noted that the combined Akiyama and Anderson' system did not specifically teach that the plurality of second tasks each having a priority classification, and said selecting units is operable to select the at least one second task from among the plurality of second tasks according to the priority classification. However, the combined Akiyama and Anderson' system disclosed the selecting units is operable to select the at least one second task from among the plurality of second tasks for execution according to the task list in a top to bottom order (Anderson, col.7, lines 43-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that selecting the task for execution according to the task list in a top to bottom order is the same as selecting the task for execution based on the priority of the task (i.e. the order of the task in the task list is its priority), and since the tasks are stored in the list, thus each of the task has a priority

Art Unit: 2195

classification (i.e. based on the order in the list). therefore, it would have been motivated for one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the combined Akiyama and Anderson's system to control the execution time in the system so that real-time tasks from a different applications can be dynamically scheduled without conflicts on the system as suggested in Anderson (col. 1, lines 9-13).

10. As per claim 3, Akiyama did not specifically teach that wherein said assigning unit is operable to determine a time of the second time slot which is a residual time obtained by subtracting a total time of time slots to which the plurality of first tasks are assigned from a time of a predetermined period.

11. However, Anderson teaches that wherein said assigning unit is operable to determine a time of the second time slot which is a residual time obtained by subtracting a total time of time slots to which the plurality of first tasks are assigned from a time of a predetermined period (col. 3, lines 19-47).

12. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of determine a time of the second time slot which is a residual time obtained by subtracting a total time of time slots to which the plurality of first tasks are assigned from a time of a predetermined period as disclosed in Anderson's system into Akiyama's stem to produce a system that controlling execution time in the system so that real-time tasks from a different

Art Unit: 2195

applications can be dynamically scheduled without conflicts on the system as suggested in Anderson (col. 1, lines 9-13).

13. As per claim 4, Akiyama did not specifically teach that wherein said assigning unit is operable to recalculate the residual time so as to determine the residual time as the time of the second time slot every time said assigning unit assigns a new first task to a time slot.

14. However, Anderson teaches that wherein said assigning unit is operable to recalculate the residual time so as to determine the residual time as the time of the second time slot every time said assigning unit assigns a new first task to a time slot (col. 3, lines 38-47).

15. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of recalculate the residual time so as to determine the residual time as the time of the second time slot every time said assigning unit assigns a new first task to a time slot as disclosed in Anderson's system into Akiyama's stem to produce a system that controlling execution time in the system so that real-time tasks from a different applications can be dynamically scheduled without conflicts on the system as suggested in Anderson (col. 1, lines 9-13).



Art Unit: 2195

16. As per claim 5, Akiyama did not specifically teach wherein the first task is a task including a specification of an assignment time, and said assigning unit, when trying to add a new first task, in the case where the total sum of the total assignment times of already-assigned tasks and an assignment time of a new first task exceeds a time period refuses to assign a first time slot to the new first task.

17. However, Anderson teaches wherein the first task is a task including a specification of an assignment time, and said assigning unit, when trying to add a new first task, in the case where the total sum of the total assignment times of already-assigned tasks and an assignment time of a new first task exceeds a time period refuses to assign a first time slot to the new first task (abstract; col. 3, lines 20-50).

18. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of the first task is a task including a specification of an assignment time, and said assigning unit, when trying to add a new first task, in the case where the total sum of the total assignment times of already-assigned tasks and an assignment time of a new first task exceeds a time period refuses to assign a first time slot to the new first task as disclosed in Anderson's system into Akiyama's stem to produce a system that controlling execution time in the system so that real-time tasks from a different applications can be dynamically scheduled without conflicts on the system as suggested in Anderson (col. 1, lines 9-13).

Art Unit: 2195

19. As per claims 15-16, they are method and computer readable recording medium claims that corresponding to system claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

20. As per claim 17, Anderson teaches that wherein each of the plurality of first tasks is a task required to satisfy processing performance in series, and each of the plurality of second tasks is a task not required to satisfy processing performance in series (col.6, lines 19-26).

21. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama et al. (hereafter Akiyama) (U.S. Patent No. 6430594), in view of Anderson et al. (hereafter Anderson) (U.S. Patent No. 5628013), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Goldick (US 2003/0093457).

22. Goldick was cited in the previous office action.

23. As per Claim 6, Akiyama and Anderson teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Akiyama and Anderson did not specifically teach a storing unit capable to store lock information showing whether a resource capable of being accessed by a tasks is in a lock state because of access by any tasks or not, and a changing unit operable to change a state of a task from an executable state to a waiting state when the task under execution is trying to access a resource in a lock state and

Art Unit: 2195

change a state of the task from a waiting state to an executable state when the resource is unlocked, and wherein the task selecting unit eliminates a task in a waiting state from selecting targets.

24. However, Goldick disclose an apparatus that storing unit capable to store lock information showing whether a resource capable of being accessed by a tasks is in a lock state because of access by any tasks or not (paragraph [0012]), and a changing unit operable to change a state of a task from an executable state to a waiting state when the task under execution is trying to access a resource in a lock state and change a state of the task from a waiting state to an executable state when the resource is unlocked, and wherein the task selecting unit eliminates a task in a waiting state from selecting targets (paragraphs [0020], [0084]).

25. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of Goldick storing unit and changing unit into Akiyama and Anderson's system to produce a system that storing lock information since it is common in multi-tasking systems to have a tasks request a resource that is locked and instead of spinning on that tasks to place the task in a queue until the lock is free and then reactivating the waiting task.

26. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama et al. (hereafter Akiyama) (U.S. Patent No. 6430594), in view of Anderson et al.

Art Unit: 2195

(hereafter Anderson) (U.S. Patent No. 5628013), and in view of Goldick (US 2003/0093457), as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Hoogerbrugge (US 2006/0069738).

27. Goldick and Hoogerbrugge were cited in the previous office action.

28. As per claim 7, Akiyama, Anderson, and Goldick teach the claimed invention substantially as claimed in claim 6. Akiyama, Anderson, and Goldick did not specifically teach a shifting unit operable to shift the processor to a power-saving state when no tasks is included in first type and second type tasks.

29. However, Hoogerbrugge a shifting unit operable to shift the processor to a power-saving state when no tasks is included in first type and second type tasks (abstract, lines 8-19).

30. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of a shifting unit operable to shift the processor to a power-saving state when no tasks is included in first type and second type tasks as disclosed in Hoogerbrugge into Akiyama, Anderson, and Goldick's system to produce a system that capable of switch to a power-saving mode when the processor is not being used to thereby saving on the overall drain on the system therefore freeing more resources for other computing functions.

Art Unit: 2195

31. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama et al. (hereafter Akiyama) (U.S. Patent No. 6430594), in view of Anderson et al. (hereafter Anderson) (U.S. Patent No. 5628013), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of D'Souza (US 6,052,707).

32. D'Souza was cited in the previous office action.

33. As per claim 8, Akiyama and Anderson teach the claimed invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Akiyama and Anderson did not specifically teach a switching unit operable to prepare one of the register sets for using it for a task under execution, and return the context of a task to be completed next to another register set using background processing and switch register sets when switching time slots.

34. However D'Souza teaches a switching unit operable to prepare one of the register sets for using it for a task under execution, and return the context of a task to be completed next to another register set using background processing and switch register sets when switching time slots (column 6, lines 16-35).

35. It would have been obvious to one an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try to incorporate the teaching of D'Souza's switching unit into Akiyama and Anderson's system to produce a system that capable of maintaining the contexts of tasks during task switching.

***Response to Arguments***

36. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

37. In addition, in the remark applicant argued that (1) the combined of Akiyama and Anderson's system fail to teach tasks switching; (2) priority based task execution.

38. Examiner respectfully disagreed with applicant argument. As to point (1) and (2), the combined of Akiyama and Anderson's system teach tasks switching, and priority based task execution (see office action above, paragraphs 5 and 9).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

39. Claims 9-14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

***Conclusion***

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER N. TO whose telephone number is (571)272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2195

41. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

42. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Jennifer To/  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2195